Apr 23, 2007

PIAY 15 2007

FCC Public Comments 445 12th Street SW Washington, DC 20554 PRESENCE COPY GRADIM

Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

As a consumer interested in protecting competition, innovation, and legitimate use of cable TV content, I urge you to refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR. 76.1204(a) (1) by NCTA, Charter, Verizon, and all other cable providers. The FCC's integration ban, which in effect requires cable companies to integrate CableCARDs into their own sel-top boxes, remains good policy today.

Nor, ten years after the Telecommunications Act of 1996, cable companies have dragged their feet long enough on competitive alternatives to proprietary set-top boxes, thus hampering innovation and harming consumers. The integration ban will also help market competition prevent further restrictions on cable subscribers' ability to make legitimate use of recorded content.

By adopting content protection limits (encoding rules) in docket no. 97-80, the Commission recognized the importance of allowing consumers to make certain uses of TV content, regardless of a particular cable provider's or copyright holder's wishes. With competition spurred on by the integration ban, consumers would have the freedom to choose the least restrictive cable-compatible device available. The CableCARD standard already prescribes restrictions that harm consumers by limiting non-infringing uses, and such restrictions will get even worse if cable providers' set-top boxes are unchecked by competition.

Please refuse requests for waivers of 41 CFR 76.1204(a) (1).

Sincerely,

Mi. Chaim Krause 3931 N Byfield Ave Kansas City, MO 64154-1840

> No. of Copies rec'd <u>()</u> List ABCDE

## INQUIRY FOR CHAIM KRAUSE

Complaint Type Cable		Account Type Residential	Congressional Complaint			
IC Number	07-FO274438	Case Type:	Inquiry			
Date Received:	04/21/2007	Complainant:	Chaim Krause			
Date Entered Entered By: Assigned To:	04/25/2007 PORTALSV1 Judy Camel/FCCIN	Date Assigned: Date Reassigned: Service Date:	04/25/2007			
Date Closed: Closed By:		Response Date: Original Analyst:				
Close Letter Needed?	○ ves ● No	Purged By:	Purged Date:			
		Removed By:	Removed Date:			
Supervisor Check.	○ Yes ● No	Indecency Referral Code.				
Current Status: I	Pending Further Informa					
View Complaint	As	ssociated Case:				
Apparent Carrier(s):  Yes<< Check he Problem Number:	No. 2	Wireline and Wireless carrier.	and the contract of the second and an experience of the contract of the contra			
Title: None	First Name: Chaim	Middle Initial:	Last Name: Krause			
Contact Number: Fax Number: Email Address:	Ext.	Best Time to Call: Consumer's Telephone Numb TTY Number: Internet Address:	per: Ext.			
PO Box:	// O'h	Address:	8931 N Byfield Ave			
City:	Kansas City	State: MO	Zip: 64154			
On Behalf Of:						
Company Name:						
Party's Name:			Relationship with the Party:			
Party's Contact Nu	ımber: Ext.	PO Box: Address: City:State:Zip:				
Other Party that ca	an be contacted?	orty.otate.zip.				
Name:		Relationship:				
Contact Number: [	Ext.	Address: City:, State: Zip:	Address:			
**Amount of credit F	CC effort generated:	Duplicate Credit Checker				

Have you paid any of the disputed charges?

Did the company billing for these charges adjust or refund some or all of the disputed charges?

If yes. what was the amount of the adjustment or refund?

b Telephone number for the carrier(s) or company(ies) involved

with your complaint. including area code:

Phone: Ext:

c Which type of service is involved with your complaint:

## TCPA Information from 475

1. the telephone number of the	Ext: Ext:  Ext:		
<ul> <li>2 your telephone number(s) on</li> <li>3 a description of the telemark identification of the comparphone numbers that were in</li> <li>4 the "opt-out" number(s) provided in the conditional calls or faxes.)</li> <li>5. Have you: (a) purchased any (b) made an inquiry or application you the call or fax? If so. pleading the condition of th</li></ul>			
ANALYSIS SECTION			
Correspondence Type:	Complaint Inquiry	Source Code:	Postal Mail
Apparent Carrier(s):		Re-Serve Carrier(s):	
Responding Carrier(s):		Assigned Subject Code:	OTHER
Activity Code: Final Responsible Party:	Direct	Other Code Description Assigned Code <b>Acronym</b> : Sub-Category:	Filing comments OTHE  Other
		Additional Sub-Category:	Provided in the control of the contr
Copy of Response Sent to Consumer by Carrier?:	○ Yes ○ No		
Mediation with Carrier/Complainant?:	○ Yes ○ No	Response Type:	
Referral <b>Information</b> Date Referred:			Consumer Referral Letter Agency Re
Referred To:	Agency <b>Name(s)</b> :	Company Name(s):	SEATTAL ELECTRONICO
		C	ti Dismissa
		DNC + More	Information TFA

DNC - Enforcement

DNC - Exemption Non DNC - More information TFAX More

Actionable Case:		O Actionable	<b>e</b> VoriAd	icnable				
DNC Enforcement L	_etter Generated?	O Yes ♥ No	O Yes	<b>e</b> No	TFAX Enforcement	Letter Generated?		
DNC More Info Letter Generated?			O Yes	• No	No TFAX Exemption Letter Generated?			
DNC Exemption Letter Generated?					No TFAX More Info Letter Generated?			
Non DNC More Info Letter Generated?								
Deferment Information	ion		Reason:		None	· :		
Date UnDeferred:								
Extension Informat	ion:							
Extension Requeste	ed: O Yes   No							
Extension Granted:		0						
SERVE INFORMATI	ION							
COMMENTS								
Comment History: 05/02/2007-Judy Camel Waiting on an answer on how to handle this JEC 0510212007-Judy Camel Waiting on an answer on how to handle this. JEC								
DOCUMENT HISTO	PRY							
Cleated by	OSCARServer		Date	04/25/2007	06:00 PM			
Last Edited by	Judy Camel Judy Camel Judy Camel	· 	Date	05/02/2007 05/02/2007 05/02/2007	12:37 PM			

Processed By Gettysburg - Judy Camel